

Part IV - Representation and Instructions
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

PHASE I

This Section M shall not be included in the resultant contract

M.1 PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACT AWARD

- a. Proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions in Section L. Proposals will be reviewed for compliance with the solicitation requirements.
- b. A Proposal may be rejected as grossly deficient if the Contracting Officer determines that the proposal does not materially comply with the requirements. A proposal may be rejected as grossly deficient and excluded from further consideration for award under the following conditions:

If the Contracting Officer determines that the proposal does not materially comply with the requirements, including failure to meet any of the GO/NO NO evaluations.

If a major rewrite of any section or sections is required to permit evaluation.

Any proposal that includes "redlines", condition(s) of offer, or any other deviation from the requirements of the solicitation.

The Contracting Officer will notify any Offeror whose proposal is rejected as grossly deficient in writing within 14 days.

- c. The Government may (1) reject any or all offers if such action is in the public interest, (2) accept other than the lowest offer, and (3) waive informalities and minor irregularities in offers received.
- d. Under the Best Value Continuum, utilizing the trade-off process, the Government reserves the right to award a contract to other than the lowest priced Offeror. Prospective Offerors are advised that proposals with the lowest price may not be chosen for award if a higher priced proposal is determined, by evaluation of the proposals according to the established evaluation factors, to be more advantageous to the Government. In such case, the superiority of the successful offeror in areas other than price would justify the added expenditure.
- e. The Coast Guard will not evaluate any proposal information not contained within the body of the proposal. Letters of transmittal and/or cover letters and tables of content are not considered part of the body of the proposal.
- f. An offeror may be a prime on only one proposal. Offerors may not submit alternate proposals.

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD

- a. In order to be eligible for award, the Offeror's proposal must comply in all material respects with the requirements of law, regulation, and the terms and conditions set forth in the solicitation; and the Offeror must be determined responsible according to the standards set forth in FAR Subpart 9.1.
- b. The contract award decision will be based on those proposals which are most

Part IV - Representation and Instructions
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

advantageous to the Government in terms of the established evaluation factors. The Source Selection Authority will determine which proposal is most advantageous to the Government.

c. Neither financial data submitted with an offer, nor representations concerning facilities or financing, will form a part of the resulting contract. However, if the resulting contract contains a clause providing for price reduction for defective cost or pricing data, the contract price will be subject to reduction if cost or pricing data furnished is incomplete, inaccurate or not current.

M.3 EVALUATION FACTORS

a. Contracts will be awarded to the up to three responsible Offerors' whose proposal, conforming to the solicitation, will be most advantageous to the Government.

b. All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

c. The evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance.

- Factor 1 - Concept Design (Section M.4)
- Factor 2 - Design Approach (Section M.4)
- Factor 3 - Organizational Management (Section M.5)
- Factor 4 - Production Capability (Section M.5)
- Factor 5 - Past Performance (Section M.6)
- Factor 6 - Small Disadvantaged Business (Section M.7)
- Factor 7 - Price (Section M.8)

d. Small Disadvantaged Business participation will be evaluated but not rated.

e. The Price for Phase I can not exceed \$22,000,000.

Part IV - Representation and Instructions
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

a. Each proposal's Concept Design will be evaluated on a GO/NO GO basis to determine whether the design meets the following design constraints:

- (1) The OPC hull structure shall be steel (OPC Sys. Spec. Sect. 100.1.2)
- (2) Maximum beam shall be less than or equal to 54 ft. (OPC Sys. Spec. Sect. 070.3.5.1 Table 070-1)
- (3) The projected draft of the cutter shall not exceed 23'-6" in any loading condition. (OPC Sys. Spec. Sect. 070.3.5.1 Table 070-1)
- (4) Ship shall have fore-and-aft, Port and Starboard, access on weather decks allowing personnel to traverse the length of the ship without use of vertical ladders (inclined ladders are acceptable). (OPC Sys. Spec. Sect. 070.3.18.1)

b. Any proposal which does not meet any one of these requirements will be rejected as grossly deficient (M.1.b.).

c. The Phase I Technical Evaluation will identify strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses and deficiencies. Each Technical Evaluation Factor criteria will be assigned a rating and an assessment of the level of associated risk. The Technical Evaluation Sub-factors are as follows:

Factor 1 – Concept Design: The soundness of the Offeror's Concept Design will be evaluated to determine to what degree it is balanced, i.e. internally consistent, accurate and feasible, and the extent to which it is a basis for the development of a Preliminary and Contract Design that will meet or exceed OPC requirements. The Concept Design will also be assessed to determine the Mission Effectiveness.

Factor 2 – Design Approach: The soundness of the Offeror's Design Approach and Engineering Processes will be assessed to determine the extent to which they support producing an OPC Preliminary Design and Contract Design that meets or exceeds the OPC requirements.

M.5 MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

a. The Phase I Management Evaluation will identify strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses and deficiencies. Each factor will be evaluated for risk. The risk rating will reflect the Government's confidence in the offeror's ability to successfully perform the management effort described in its proposal.

Factor 3 - Organizational Management: The evaluation will assess how well the Offeror's organizational management approach, processes, and personnel will be capable of designing, developing, and constructing an OPC from contract award through delivery of OPC nine.

Factor 4 - Production Capability: The evaluation will assess the extent of the Offeror's proposed production capabilities and plan maturity to develop production capabilities to construct OPCs from contract award through delivery of OPC nine.

Part IV - Representation and Instructions
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE

- a. Past performance will be evaluated to determine the Offeror's, and the Offeror's proposed Design Agent's, capability to meet performance requirements. Evaluation of past performance will be subjective, based on consideration of all relevant past performance information obtained by the Government. It will include a determination of the Offeror's commitment to customer satisfaction and will include conclusions of informed judgment
- b. The past performance evaluation will be based on the Offeror's Past Performance Questionnaire and information obtained from previous or current customers of the Offeror. Review of past performance will not be limited to the information provided in the questionnaire submitted by the Offeror. The Government may verify information from other sources and on other contracts, not listed in the questionnaire, performed by the Offeror.
- c. In assessing the relevancy of past performance data, the Government will give consideration to contracts during the past five years that required the same or similar work in both type and complexity as that required for the OPC solicitation. Contracts with completed deliveries may be deemed more relevant than contracts without completed deliveries.
- d. All Offeror-provided past performance information will be evaluated, as well as data from other sources both in and outside the Government, regarding an Offeror's, and the Offeror's proposed Design Agent's past performance. The Government intends to review ratings and other information contained in the Federal Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and other sources. The Government may also contact references and other past customers to verify statements and representations made in the Offeror's proposal. The Government will determine which past performance data is most relevant. Past performance information obtained independently of the Offeror's proposal may be more relevant than past performance information submitted by the Offeror. It is incumbent upon the Offeror to explain the relevance of the data provided. Offerors are reminded that while the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of providing thorough and complete past performance source data rests with the Offerors.
- e. An Offeror without a record of relevant past performance will be given a "Neutral" rating on the Past Performance factor. However, the proposal of an Offeror with no relevant past performance history, while rated Neutral in past performance, may or may not represent the most advantageous proposal to the Government and thus, may or may not be an unsuccessful proposal when compared to the proposals of other Offerors.
- f. Past performance will be evaluated for relevance based on the past performance narrative included in the Offeror's proposal. If an example of past performance is determined to be non-relevant, it will not be further evaluated for quality of performance. For those past performance examples determined to be relevant or somewhat relevant, the Past Performance Evaluation will be based on the following listed in descending order of importance.

- **Overall Customer Satisfaction** - Would the customer select this firm again?

Part IV - Representation and Instructions
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

- **Cost Control** - Delivered within budget, provided current and accurate/complete billings, and relationship of negotiated costs to actuals.
- **Quality of Product** - Compliance with contract requirements, accuracy of reports, technical excellence, management responsiveness, appropriateness of personnel, and stood behind warranty.
- **Timeliness of Performance** - Met interim milestones, reliable, completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration.

M.7 SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

- a. Evaluation of the Small Disadvantaged Business Participation will be a subjective assessment based upon a consideration of relevant facts and circumstances. It will not be based upon absolute standards of acceptable performance. The Government is seeking to determine whether the offeror has demonstrated a commitment to use SDB concerns for the work that it intends to perform as the prime contractor.
- b. The Government will assess the Offeror's Small Business subcontracting strategy for the extent of commitment to use SB's and the consistency of that commitment within the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

M.8 PRICE

- a. The Government will evaluate the Firm Fixed Price proposed for CLIN 0001.
- b. Any proposal which includes a proposed price that exceeds \$22,000,000 will be rejected as grossly deficient (M.1.b.).